

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION

---

LOREN JANOSKY,	}	
	}	
Plaintiff,	}	
	}	
vs.	}	No. 07-2199-JDB/tmp
	}	
TONY PARKER, et al.,	}	
	}	
Defendants.	}	
	}	

---

ORDER ASSESSING FILING FEE  
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL  
ORDER OF DISMISSAL  
AND  
ORDER CERTIFYING APPEAL NOT TAKEN IN GOOD FAITH

---

Plaintiff Loren Janoksy, Tennessee Department of Correction ("TDOC") registration number 304039, an inmate at the West Tennessee State Prison ("WTSP"),<sup>1</sup> in Henning, Tennessee filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, along with motions to proceed in forma pauperis and for appointment of counsel. The Clerk of Court shall record Defendants as Tony Parker, Henry Stewart, Robert Adams, Don Willis, Stacie Alexander, Marsha Austill, Samantha Phillips, George Little and Roland Colson.

---

<sup>1</sup> The word prison is used in this order to refer to all places of confinement or incarceration, including jails, penal farms, detention and classification facilities, or halfway houses.

I. Assessment of Filing Fee

Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PLRA), 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b), all prisoners bringing a civil action must pay the full filing fee of \$350 required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). The in forma pauperis statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) merely provides the prisoner the opportunity to make a "downpayment" of a partial filing fee and pay the remainder in installments.

In this case, Plaintiff has properly completed and submitted both an in forma pauperis affidavit and a prison trust fund account statement. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1), it is ORDERED that the Plaintiff cooperate fully with prison officials in carrying out this order. It is further ORDERED that the trust fund officer at Plaintiff's prison shall calculate a partial initial filing fee equal to twenty percent (20%) of the greater of the average balance in or deposits to Plaintiff's trust fund account for the six months immediately preceding the completion of the affidavit. When the account contains any funds, the trust fund officer shall collect them and pay them directly to the Clerk of Court. If the funds in Plaintiff's account are insufficient to pay the full amount of the initial partial filing fee, the prison official is instructed to withdraw all of the funds in Plaintiff's account and forward them to the Clerk of Court.

On each occasion that funds are subsequently credited to Plaintiff's account the prison official shall immediately withdraw

those funds and forward them to the Clerk of Court, until the initial partial filing fee is paid in full.

It is further ORDERED that after the initial partial filing fee is fully paid, the trust fund officer shall withdraw from Plaintiff's account and pay to the Clerk of this Court monthly payments equal to twenty percent (20%) of all deposits credited to Plaintiff's account during the preceding month, but only when the amount in the account exceeds \$10.00, until the entire \$350.00 filing fee is paid.

Each time that the trust fund officer makes a payment to the Court as required by this order, he shall print a copy of the prisoner's account statement showing all activity in the account since the last payment under this order, and file it with the Clerk along with the payment.

All payments and account statements shall be sent to:

Clerk, United States District Court, Western District of Tennessee, 167 N. Main, Room 242, Memphis, TN 38103

and shall clearly identify Plaintiff's name and the case number on the first page of this order.

If Plaintiff is transferred to a different prison or released, he is ORDERED to notify the Court immediately of his change of address. If still confined he shall provide the officials at the new prison with a copy of this order.

If the Plaintiff fails to abide by these or any other requirement of this order, the Court may impose appropriate

sanctions, including a monetary fine, without any additional notice or hearing by the Court.

The Clerk shall mail a copy of this order to the prison official in charge of prison trust fund accounts at Plaintiff's prison. The obligation to pay this filing fee shall continue despite the immediate dismissal of this case. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The Clerk shall not issue process or serve any papers in this case.

## II. Motion for Appointment of Counsel

A district court is vested with broad discretion in determining whether to appoint counsel for an indigent civil litigant. See Lavado v. Keohane, 992 F.2d 601, 604-05 (6th Cir. 1993). Notably, however, appointment of counsel in a civil case is not a constitutional right, and courts generally do not appoint counsel in a civil case absent a showing of "exceptional circumstances." Id. at 605-06.

In determining whether an appointment is warranted, courts evaluate the type of case, the complexity of the factual and legal issues involved, and the ability of the litigant to represent himself. See id. at 606; Kilgo v. Ricks, 983 F.2d 189, 193 (11th Cir. 1993)("The key [to determining whether exceptional circumstances exist] is whether the pro se litigant needs help in presenting the essential merits of his or her position to the court. Where the facts and issues are simple, he or she usually will not need such help.") Appointment of counsel in a civil case is not

appropriate when a litigant's claims are frivolous, or when the chances of success are extremely slim. See Lavado, 992 F.2d at 604-05; Maclin v. Freake, 650 F.2d 885, 887 (7th Cir. 1981)("[B]efore the court is justified in exercising its discretion in favor of appointment, it must first appear that the claim has some merit in fact and law."). As a general rule, counsel should be appointed in civil cases only if a litigant has made "a threshold showing of some likelihood of merit." Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co., 877 F.2d 170, 174 (2d Cir. 1989).<sup>2</sup>

The Court concludes that an appointment of counsel is not warranted. Plaintiff's complaint is to be dismissed; therefore his motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED.

### III. Analysis of Plaintiff's Claims

Janosky sues WTSP Warden Parker, Assistant Warden Henry Stewart, Dr. Robert Adams, Nurse Practitioner Don Willis, Corporal Stacie Alexander, Nurse Marsha Austill, Health Director Samantha Phillips, TDOC Commissioner George Little, and Assistant Commissioner Roland Colson. The complaint alleges that "there was negligence on behalf of WTSP by letting inmates with [tuberculosis] be allowed in general population instead of isolating them in a designated area." Plaintiff alleges that he was exposed to the

---

<sup>2</sup> The Second Circuit elaborated: "Courts do not perform a useful service if they appoint a volunteer lawyer to a case which a private lawyer would not take if it were brought to his or her attention. Nor do courts perform a socially justified function when they request the services of a volunteer lawyer for a meritless case that no lawyer would take were the plaintiff not indigent." Id.

infection and has now tested positive which requires that he either submit to medication or be confined to segregation. He claims that he will be required to take medication on a daily basis for nine months and is at risk of developing "full bloom" tuberculosis at any time for the rest of his life. Janosky asserts that the Defendants failed to exercise reasonable care and acted with reckless and careless disregard of his right to "life and safety." He has attached a grievance form and responses which detail Plaintiff's requests to see an outside specialist and for followup treatment. The inmate seeks a full investigation, followup medical treatment, and 1.5 million dollars in damages.

The Court is required to screen prisoner complaints and to dismiss any complaint, or any portion thereof, if the complaint—

(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or

(2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Even claims that have not been exhausted may be dismissed on the merits. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c)(2).<sup>3</sup> Plaintiff's complaint is subject to dismissal in its entirety.

The Eighth Amendment prohibits cruel and unusual punishment. See generally Wilson v. Seiter, 501 U.S. 294 (1991). An Eighth

---

<sup>3</sup> To the extent plaintiff's exhibits and allegations are insufficient to demonstrate total exhaustion, the Court screens his complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c)(2).

Amendment claim consists of both objective and subjective components. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 834 (1994); Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 8 (1992); Wilson, 501 U.S. at 298; Brooks v. Celeste, 39 F.3d 125, 127-28 (6th Cir. 1994); Hunt v. Reynolds, 974 F.2d 734, 735 (6th Cir. 1992). The objective component requires that the deprivation be "sufficiently serious." Farmer, 511 U.S. at 834; Hudson, 503 U.S. at 8; Wilson, 501 U.S. at 298. The subjective component requires that the official act with the requisite intent, that is, that he have a "sufficiently culpable state of mind." Farmer, 511 U.S. at 834; Wilson, 501 U.S. at 297, 302-03. The official's intent must rise at least to the level of deliberate indifference. Farmer, 511 U.S. at 834; Wilson, 501 U.S. at 303.

To satisfy the objective component of an Eighth Amendment claim, a prisoner must show that he "is incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm," Farmer, 511 U.S. at 834; Stewart v. Love, 796 F.2d 43, 44 (6th Cir. 1982), or that he has been deprived of the "minimal civilized measure of life's necessities," Wilson, 501 U.S. at 298 (quoting Rhodes v. Chapman, 452 U.S. 337, 347 (1981)). The Constitution "'does not mandate comfortable prisons.'" Wilson, 501 U.S. at 298 (quoting Rhodes, 452 U.S. at 349). Rather, "routine discomfort 'is part of the penalty that criminal offenders pay for their offenses against society.'" Hudson, 503 U.S. at 9 (quoting Rhodes, 452 U.S. at 347).

In considering the types of conditions that constitute a substantial risk of serious harm, the Court considers not only the

seriousness of the potential harm and the likelihood that the harm will actually occur, but evidence that unwilling exposure to that risk violates contemporary standards of decency, *i.e.*, that society does not choose to tolerate this risk in its prisons. Helling v. McKinney, 509 U.S. 25, 36 (1993).

As a preliminary matter, the complaint does not allege the objective component for an Eighth Amendment violation. The complaint fails to allege that any named Defendant knew that an inmate had tuberculosis and disregarded the risk, thereby exposing other inmates and staff to the infectious disease by failing to take reasonable measures to abate it. Street v. Corrections Corp. of America, 102 F.3d 810, 815-16 (6th Cir. 1996); Sanderfer v. Nichols, 62 F.3d 151, 154-55 (6th Cir. 1995). Furthermore, the complaint, on its face, admits that Plaintiff received medical testing after officials recognized inmates were exposed to the disease and treatment after he tested positive.

The complaint also fails to establish the subjective component of an Eighth Amendment violation. To establish liability under the Eighth Amendment for a claim based on failure to prevent harm to a prisoner, a prisoner must show that the prison officials acted with "deliberate indifference" to a substantial risk that the prisoner would suffer serious harm. Farmer, 511 U.S. at 834; Helling v. McKinney, 509 U.S. 25, 32 (1993); Woods v. Lecureux, 110 F.3d 1215, 1222 (6th Cir. 1997); Street v. Corrections Corp. of Am., 102 F.3d 810, 814 (6th Cir. 1996); Taylor v. Michigan Dep't of Corrections,



69 F.3d 76, 79 (6th Cir. 1995). "[D]eliberate indifference describes a state of mind more blameworthy than negligence." Farmer, 511 U.S. at 835. Thus,

[a] prison official cannot be found liable under the Eighth Amendment for denying an inmate humane conditions of confinement unless the official knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference. This approach comports best with the text of the Eighth Amendment as our cases have interpreted it. The Eighth Amendment does not outlaw cruel and unusual "conditions"; it outlaws cruel and unusual "punishments." An act or omission unaccompanied by knowledge of a significant risk of harm might well be something society wishes to discourage, and if harm does result society might well wish to assure compensation. The common law reflects such concerns when it imposes tort liability on a purely objective basis. . . . But an official's failure to alleviate a significant risk that he should have perceived but did not, while no cause for commendation, cannot under our cases be condemned as the infliction of punishment.

Id. at 837-38 (emphasis added; citations omitted); see also Lewellen v. Metropolitan Gov't of Nashville & Davidson County, 34 F.3d 345, 348 (6th Cir. 1994) ("[T]he defendants obviously did not make a deliberate decision to inflict pain and bodily injury on the plaintiff. The defendants may have been negligent, but it is now firmly settled that injury caused by negligence does not constitute a 'deprivation' of any constitutionally protected interest.").

In this case, the complaint alleges, at most, that prison officials negligently failed to recognize that a tuberculosis infected inmate was in general population. Plaintiff admits that inmates were tested and either treated or isolated once the presence

of the infectious disease was determined. Plaintiff's last submission in this lawsuit reflects that Defendant Phillips was encouraging inmates to attend a video on tuberculosis control, conduct that is the opposite of deliberate indifference.

Moreover, Defendants Parker, Stewart, Phillips, Little, and Colson cannot be held liable on the basis of their supervisory positions at the WTSP and TDOC. There is no respondeat superior liability under § 1983. Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 436 U.S. 658, 691 (1978); Bellamy v. Bradley, 729 F.2d 416, 421 (6th Cir. 1984) (liability under § 1983 in a defendant's personal capacity must be predicated upon some showing of direct, active participation in the alleged misconduct).

Plaintiff does not provide any allegations demonstrating that anyone has been deliberately indifferent to his medical needs. He admits that he has received medical evaluation. Although Plaintiff may disagree with the decisions made regarding his need for evaluation and further treatment, a difference of opinion between a prisoner and medical personnel about diagnosis or treatment fails to state an Eighth Amendment claim of deliberate indifference to a serious medical need. Westlake v. Lucas, 537 F.2d 857, 860 n. 5 (6th Cir. 1976).

Even if Dr. Adams, Nurse Practitioner Willis, Nurse Austill or other medical personnel were negligent in examining, diagnosing, or treating Plaintiff or any other inmate, their error would amount at most to medical malpractice. "[A] complaint that a physician has

been negligent in diagnosing or treating a medical condition does not state a valid claim of medical mistreatment under the Eighth Amendment. Medical malpractice does not become a constitutional violation merely because the victim is a prisoner." Estelle, 429 U.S. at 105-06. The complaint simply does not allege any facts supporting a claim that the Eighth Amendment was violated.

The Court therefore DISMISSES the complaint in its entirety, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and 1915A(b)(1), for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

#### IV. Appeal Issues

The next issue to be addressed is whether Plaintiff should be allowed to appeal this decision in forma pauperis. Twenty-eight U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) provides that an appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.

The good faith standard is an objective one. Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). An appeal is not taken in good faith if the issue presented is frivolous. Id. Accordingly, it would be inconsistent for a district court to determine that a complaint should be dismissed prior to service on the defendant, yet has sufficient merit to support an appeal in forma pauperis. See Williams v. Kullman, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983). The same considerations that lead the Court to dismiss this case for failure to state a claim also compel the conclusion that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

It is therefore CERTIFIED, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal in this matter by Plaintiff is not taken in good faith and Plaintiff may not proceed on appeal in forma pauperis.

The final matter to be addressed is the assessment of a filing fee if Plaintiff appeals the dismissal of this case.<sup>4</sup> In McGore v. Wigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 610-11 (6th Cir. 1997), the Sixth Circuit set out specific procedures for implementing the PLRA. Therefore, Plaintiff is instructed that, if he wishes to take advantage of the installment procedures for paying the appellate filing fee, he must comply with the procedures set out in McGore and § 1915(b).

For analysis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) of future filings, if any, by Plaintiff, this is the second dismissal of one of his cases as frivolous or for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff was previously assessed a strike in Janosky v. CCA, et al., No. 06-1176-JDT/sta (W.D. Tenn. Mar. 22, 2007)(dismissing § 1983 complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and § 1915A(b)(1) for failure to state a claim.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 18<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007.

s/ J. DANIEL BREEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>4</sup> The appellate filing fee is \$455.